

UNITED STATES BEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

| AF | PHICATIONNO, 758FILING PATE 07/95 | DERFIRST NAMED INVE | NTOR | Н | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO 125 |
|----|--|---------------------|------|--------------|------------------------|
| Γ | 020350 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND TWO EMBARCADERO CENTE | R EIGHTH FLOOR | コ | HAU | EXAMINER |
| | SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111 | | | ART UNET 1 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: | 11/26/97 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



Advisory Action

Application No. 08/476,798

Applicant(s)

Deboer et al.

Examiner

Karen M. Hauda

Group Art Unit 1819



| a) expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection. Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding mount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be determined the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding mount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be determined the purposes of the final rejection. From the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on period for response or as set forth in b) above. Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Nov 10, 1997 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT dement to place the application in condition for ellowance: The proposed amendment(s): will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief. will not be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief. will not be entered because: they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below). they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below). they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below). they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below). they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below). Applicant's person to demend to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issue | | PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)] | |
|--|---|--|--|
| is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection. Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally see interined estudiory period for response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally see incorresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the original year of the calculated from the date of the original year. Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on | | . — | |
| date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be determining the period of correspondence and on the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be according to the final property of the Notice of Appeal filed on period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a). Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Nov 10, 1937 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance: Will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief. Will not be entered because: Will the present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: Claims 99-113 recite embodiments of an invention not previously claimed. These claims would require a new search and/or consideration for enablement issues not previously under consideration. Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims allowed: Claims allowed: Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims objected to: Claims obj | | is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the d | ction, whichever ate of the final |
| period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a). Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on | | late on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for th letermining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1. | e purposes of |
| but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance: The proposed amendment(s): will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief. will not be entered because: they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below). they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below). they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: Claims 99-113 recite embodiments of an invention not previously claimed. These claims would require a new search and/or consideration for enablement issues not previously under consideration. Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims | | Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a). | (or within any |
| will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief. will not be entered because: Would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. Newly proposed or amended claims | | | wing effect, |
| will not be entered because: | X | The proposed amendment(s): | |
| they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below). they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below). they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: Claims 99-113 recite embodiments of an invention not previously claimed. These claims would require a new search and/or consideration for enablement issues not previously under consideration. Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Mewly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant's effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filing date of the 691, so an interference is not warranted. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 98 | | ☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief. | |
| they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below). they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: Claims 99-113 recite embodiments of an invention not previously claimed. These claims would require a new search and/or consideration for enablement issues not previously under consideration. Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant's effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filing date of the 1591, so an interference is not warranted. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 98 The proposed drawing correction filed on has has not been approved by the Examiner. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) UASEMINE C. CHAMBERS, PHD. SUPERMISORY PATENT EXAMINER | | Will not be entered because: | |
| they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: Claims 99-113 recite embodiments of an invention not previously claimed. These claims would require a new search and/or consideration for enablement issues not previously under consideration. Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant's effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filing date of the 691, so an interference is not warranted. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims neglected: 98 The proposed drawing correction filed on | | X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below). | |
| issues for appeal. they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: Claims 99-113 recite embodiments of an invention not previously claimed. These claims would require a new search and/or consideration for enablement issues not previously under consideration. Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant's effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filling date of the 691, so an interference is not warranted. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 98 The proposed drawing correction filed on has not been approved by the Examiner. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) JASEMINE C. CHALABERS, PHD. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER | | they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below). | |
| NOTE: Claims 99-113 recite embodiments of an invention not previously claimed. These claims would require a new search and/or consideration for enablement issues not previously under consideration. Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant's effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filing date of the 691, so an interference is not warranted. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 98 The proposed drawing correction filed on has has not been approved by the Examiner. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) JASEMINE C. CHALBEERS, PHD. SUPERVISORY PATERIE EXAMINER | | | simplifying the |
| new search and/or consideration for enablement issues not previously under consideration. □ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): □ Newly proposed or amended claims | | they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claim | ns. |
| Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claims | | new search and/or consideration for enablement issues not previously under consideration. | |
| separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant's effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filing date of the 691, so an interference is not warranted. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 98 The proposed drawing correction filed on | | • • | |
| for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant's effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filing date of the '691, so an interference is not warranted. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 98 The proposed drawing correction filed on | | Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if so | |
| the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 98 The proposed drawing correction filed on | | separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. | ubmitted in a |
| Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 98 The proposed drawing correction filed on | X | The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the applic for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. | ation in condition |
| Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 98 The proposed drawing correction filed on hashas not been approved by the Examiner. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) Other JASEMINE C. CHAMBERS, PHD. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER | | The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 55 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. Applicant has filed under 55 USC 1.135 (b) to provo | ration in condition Applicant's not warranted. |
| Claims rejected: 98 The proposed drawing correction filed on has not been approved by the Examiner. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) Other JASEMINE C. CHAMBERS, PHD. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER | | The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. A effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filing date of the 691, so an interference is a sufficient to exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were the Examiner in the final rejection. | Applicant's not warranted. |
| Claims rejected: 98 The proposed drawing correction filed on hashas not been approved by the Examiner. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) Other JASEMINE C. CHAMBERS, PHD. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER | | The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the applic for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. A effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filing date of the 691, so an interference is a sufficient to exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any formula is a status of the claims is as follows). | Applicant's not warranted. |
| □ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) □ Other □ Other □ JASEMINE C. CHAMBERS, PHD. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER | | The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the applic for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. A effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filing date of the 691, so an interference is a sufficient to exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any claims allowed: | Applicant's not warranted. e newly raised by |
| ☐ Other ☐ JASEMINE C. CHAMBERS, PHD. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER | | The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the applic for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. A effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filing date of the 691, so an interference is a sufficient or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected to: | Applicant's not warranted. e newly raised by |
| JAŠEMINE C. CHAMBERS, PHD. SUPERVISOHY PATENT EXAMINER | | The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the applic for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filing date of the 691, so an interference is a filed avit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 98 The proposed drawing correction filed on | Applicant's not warranted. e newly raised by |
| | | The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the applic for allowance because: Applicant has filed under 35 USC 1.135 (b) to provoke an interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. A effective filing date is not within 3 months of the effective filing date of the '691, so an interference is a substitute of the interference with US Patent # 5,571,691. A substitute of the i | Applicant's not warranted. The newly raised by the Examiner. |